

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

CONTIGUITY, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRAFFIC LOGIX CORPORATION,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 3:23-cv-187-K

**DEFENDANT TRAFFIC LOGIX CORPORATION'S UNOPPOSED MOTION
TO EXTEND TIME TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO COMPLAINT**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b), Defendant Traffic Logix Corporation respectfully requests that the Court extend the deadline for Defendant to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff Contiguity, LLC's Complaint [Dkt. 1], which was filed on January 25, 2023. Defendant was served with the Complaint on February 1, 2023, and retained the undersigned counsel in this matter yesterday, February 14, 2023. Pursuant to Rule 12(a), Defendant's deadline to answer or otherwise respond is Wednesday, February 22, 2023. In order to give Defendant and its counsel an opportunity to fully analyze Defendant's options in answering or otherwise responding to the Complaint, counsel for Defendant has asked Plaintiff's counsel for a 30-day extension of the current deadline. Counsel for Plaintiff has indicated that Plaintiff is unopposed to the requested relief.

Accordingly, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court extend the deadline to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's complaint to **March 24, 2023**.

Dated: February 15, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cortney C. Thomas

Cortney C. Thomas

Texas Bar No. 24075153

cort@brownfoxlaw.com

BROWN FOX PLLC

8111 Preston Road, Suite 300

Dallas, Texas 75225

(214) 327-5000

Fax: (214) 327-5001

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
TRAFFIC LOGIX CORPORATION**

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I hereby certify that on February 14, 2023, I conferred with counsel for Plaintiff regarding a thirty-day extension of Defendant's deadline to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint. Counsel for Plaintiff indicated that Plaintiff is not opposed to the relief requested herein.

/s/ Cortney C. Thomas

Cortney C. Thomas

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(1)(B), as amended, no certificate of service is necessary because this document is being filed with the Court's electronic-filing system.